1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26	Uttar Pradesh	166.20	35.15	21.10	0.10	0.10
27	Uttaranchal	8.49	1.52	17.90	0.25	3.00
28	West Bengal	80.18	18.45	23.00	4.40	5.50
	Union Territories					
29.	A & N Islands	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.02	8.30
30.	Chandigarh	0.90	0.16	17.50	Nil	0.00
31.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	0.22	0.00	1.90	0.13	62.20
32.	Daman & Diu	0.16	0.00	3.10	0.01	8.80
33.	Delhi	13.85	2.34	16.90	Nil	0.00
34.	Lakshadweep	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.05	94.50
35.	Pondicherry	0.97	0.16	16.20	Nil	0.00

Growth in States

3174. SHRI KHEKIHO ZHIMOMI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there is huge difference in status of growth between the States, particularly in North Eastern States;

(b) if so, the details thereof and the reasons therefor;

(c) whether Government has taken some steps to ensure the equal growth of all States;

(d) if so, the details thereof;

(e) whether Government has made any specific plan for growth of backward States like North Eastern States in the Eleventh Five Year Plan; and

(f) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): (a) and (b) The data on growth rate of Gross State Domestic Product (GSDP) at 1999-2000 prices for the period from 2005-06 to 2008-09 are given in the statement (*See* below). The disparity between the national figures and that of the North-Eastern States is largely due to historical differences in socio-economic conditions, natural resource endowments, level of industrialization and differences in human capital indicators *viz*, education, health etc.

(c) to (f) The Government has been taking several measures to improve the growth rate across the country in a balanced manner. The policy instruments in this regard include Plan and Non-Plan transfer of resources from the Centre to States favouring less developed States, tax incentives for setting up of industries in the backward regions. There is a 10% mandatory earmarking

of funds by the Central Ministries/Departments concerned for the development of North-Eastern States. A number of programmes which include Backward Regions Grant Fund (BRGF), Hill Area Development Programme, Border Area Development Programme, etc. have been initiated to reduce the regional disparities.

Statement

Growth of Gross State Domestic Product (GSDP) at 1999-2000 Prices (% over previous year)

Sl. No.	Statet/UT	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-09	Annual Average Growth Rate
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Andhra Pradesh	10.24	11.16	10.62	5.5	9.4
2	Arunachal Pradesh	-4.86	12.69	3.74	N.A	3.9
3	Assam	4.94	6.97	6.06	6.0	6.0
4	Bihar	1.49	22	8.04	11.4	10.7
5	Jharkhand	2.79	12.53	6.18	5.5	6.8
6	Goa	11.33	10.37	11.14	N.A	10.9
7	Gujarat	13.44	9.09	12.79	N.A	11.8
8	Haryana	9.37	14.2	9.35	8.0	10.2
9	Himachal Pradesh	8.54	9.2	8.59	N.A	8.8
10	Jammu & Kashmir	6.17	6.25	6.28	N.A	6.2
11	Karnataka	13.53	7.33	12.92	5.1	9.7
12	Kerala	9.17	11.1	10.42	N.A	10.2
13	Madhya Pradesh	6.48	4.75	5.25	N.A	5.5
14	Chhattisgarh	6.94	7.99	8.63	7.7	7.8
15	Maharashtra	9.67	9.82	9.18	N.A	9.6
16	Manipur	4.61	3.73	6.77	7.1	5.6
17	Meghalaya	6.08	5.34	5.2	N.A	5.5
18	Mizoram	2.38	5.51	5.54	6.4	5.0
19	Nagaland	5.22	NA	NA	N.A	5.2
20	Orissa	6.37	12.12	5.85	6.7	7.8
21	Punjab	4.5	7.32	6.54	6.3	6.2
22	Rajasthan	6.89	11.81	7.33	7.1	8.3

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23	Sikkim	8.94	7.15	7.4	8.0	7.9
24	Tamil Nadu	11.89	11.29	4.41	4.6	8.0
25	Tripura	9.09	8.43	NA	N.A	8.8
26	Uttar Pradesh	5.25	7.18	7.16	6.5	6.5
27	Uttarakhand	5.66	9.84	9.37	8.7	8.4
28	West Bengal	5.72	8.77	7.74	N.A	7.4
All-India GDP (99-00 base)		9.52	9.75	9.01	6.7	8.7

Source: CSO(Central Statistical Organisation) : Data As on 27-10-2009

Criteria for poverty line

3175. SHRI. T.T.V. DHINAKARAN: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether criteria for fixing the poverty line has not been revised for long;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) whether crores of people are affected due to non revision of criteria; and

(d) if so, the action taken to revise the same?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): (a) to (d) The criteria for fixing the poverty line to estimate the poverty in the country has been reviewed from time to time to take into account the changed situation. To begin with, the Planning Commission in 1977, constituted a 'Task Force on Projections of Minimum Needs and Effective Consumption Demand', which submitted its report in 1979. The Task Force defined the poverty line as per capita consumption expenditure level of Rs. 49.09 per month in rural areas and Rs. 56.64 per capita per month in urban areas at 1973-74 prices at national level corresponding to a basket of goods and services anchored on a norm of per capita daily calorie requirement of 2400 cal in rural areas and 2100 cal in urban areas. These poverty lines were applied uniformly in all the States. In September, 1989 an Expert Group on 'Estimation of Proportion and Number of Poor' was constituted to look into the methodology for estimation of poverty and to redefine the poverty line, if necessary. The Expert Group which submitted its report in 1993 did not change the definition of poverty defined by Task Force. However, the Expert Group recommended the disaggregation of the national poverty line into state wise poverty lines in order to reflect the state wise price differences. In 2005, an Expert Group under the Chairmanship of Prof. Suresh D. Tendulkar was set up to review the methodology of estimation of poverty. The Expert Group has submitted its report recently on 08.12.2009.

East and West Godavari district projects

3176. SHRIMATI T. RATNA BAI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state: